

Report on Actions Taken by Argosy University to Address Stipulations April 2016

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents information on actions taken by Argosy University to address stipulations.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the COA remove stipulations on Argosy University and grant Accreditation to the institution. In addition, staff recommends that the COA be provided with an update as to the implementation of the unit accreditation system after the conclusion of the CAEP accreditation visit in December 2016.

Background

In February 2015, the Committee on Accreditation, on behalf of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, assigned the status of *Accreditation with Stipulations* to Argosy University. A copy of the [site visit report](#) may be found on the Commission's website.

The COA placed the following stipulation on Argosy University.

- That within one year, the institution must provide evidence that it implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.

As context, the institution has its headquarter in California (Orange County) but operates in a number of states. The only currently active program in California is the Preliminary Administrative Services Program located in the Inland Empire and San Francisco Bay area. Over the past year, the institutions' enrollment in this program has been extremely small. For 2015-16, there is only one candidate enrolled in the program. The institution has focused significant effort in trying to grow its enrollment by partnering with local education agencies and networking with other professional associations.

As a result of the small enrollment, Commission staff held discussions with the institution to determine whether it wanted to continue to offer the program, go inactive, or withdraw. The institution considers its efforts in other states, particularly in the Denver Colorado area, to be highly successful and they are attempting to replicate that model here in California by working closer with districts. As a result, the institution has decided to continue to offer an approved program.

Given this, the institution has taken steps to develop and implement a unit assessment system.

Adoption of a Formalized Data System for Collection and Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data.

The following information was provided by Argosy University regarding the adoption of a formalized data system.

Over the past eight months, the CoE has researched a number of campus wide assessment systems. Approximately four months ago, a decision was made to adopt TK20 as the data management system for the CoE. Since that time, the university information technology staff and TK20 personnel have worked to establish a link for information transmission between two systems. We have decided also to begin this migration into the new Graphite version of TK20. We have recently entered into the form development stage and assessment upload phase of this process. The anticipated date for all programs, candidates, and faculty to be active in TK20 is Summer II 2016. The system will be used for assessment data, portfolio, clinical experience evaluations, and survey data collection. It will serve as the report generating system for all accreditation purposes.

Additionally, the university is in the process of identifying a new Learning Management System (LMS) and will no longer use Pearson as of fall 2017. The remainder of the CoE courses and assessments not associated in the accreditation process will be housed in the new LMS. The systems currently under consideration all have data report generation capabilities.

Using the new system along with the TK20 system will provide the CoE with a number of data sets through which our programs, unit, and candidates will be reviewed and developed. All data will be directly uploaded by faculty, site supervisors, alum, and employers. This eliminates the manual calculation of data that has been our process in the past. Data will continue to be calculated manually until the TK20 migration is complete.

Currently, there is one candidate completing the EdD Educational Administration (Administrative Services Credential) program at the Inland Campus. He has five more content related courses. While he is completing the course requirements, assessments, and clinical experiences, his data is being collected. Individual communication with his chair is providing additional, albeit limited, anecdotal data about the program and activities.

The following chart was provided that outlines their plan for the collection and analysis of data. In addition, they provided the consultant with the data sources for the program assessment data and unit data listed below, however, that is not included here.

What	Who	Modification	When	Stakeholders/Outsiders
Program Assessment Data	All Program Chairs	Assessment data were collected, aggregated and disaggregated by each standard. The program data and the state specific data were discussed with the program chairs. These data were used for specific course and rubric review.	October 2016	Adjuncts invited to the program specific meeting. Chairs were asked to bring data to campus level advisory committees.
	California program Chairs	Assessment data specifically collected for submission to the ELCC was presented to the chairs for review and discussion. These data tables presented the aggregated and disaggregated data for all campuses allowing the specific campus to assess their program.	February 2016	SFB to specifically discuss these data with its advisory board.
Unit data	All program chairs	Survey data from university sources and the alum and employers surveys were presented. Attendees identified areas that needed further discussion. Individual chairs were to take these specific items back to his/her campus and determine the	March 2016 (sample on one data set discussed)	All faculty and adjuncts

What	Who	Modification	When	Stakeholders/Outsiders
		relevance to that site. In April 2016, participants from the March meeting will return to prioritize the items for the unit and determine a plan to address concerns specifically for their sites.		
	IE, SFB, Orange (OC), and Los Angeles (LA)	By May 2016, the CA campuses will develop a collective timeline to address unit concerns that impact those sites.		All faculty, adjuncts, and advisory members
Surveys	Department Chairs	The Ed Admin and the Ed Admin Employers' surveys were revised and distributed. Unfortunately, there were no surveys returned for the Educational Administration program of study. There were alum and employer surveys returned for the other non-certification programs offered by the CoE in California. Those surveys indicated a high level of satisfaction with those program.	February-March 2016	During the last week of February and the first week of March, each campus identified alum who were out 18 months and 5 years from each program. They were individually contacted and asked to complete the survey. They are also asked for permission to contact their employers for the distribution of those surveys.
Focus Groups	Department Chair SFB	Review Ed Administration program of study,	November 2015	Superintendents from Sacramento and Santa Rosa

What	Who	Modification	When	Stakeholders/Outsiders
		field experiences and clinical practices to ensure relevancy to the CA educational environment.		
	Department Chair SFB	Process listed above was replicated with this group and lead by the department chair and the two superintendents from November. Slight field experience modifications were made based on their recommendations.	February 2016	10 SFB and Sacramento administrators

Next steps

A CAEP revisit is scheduled for December 2016. Commission staff is scheduled to participate as is California’s protocol for all revisits with CAEP/NCATE. Staff recommends that the COA be provided an update as to the outcome of that revisit as it relates to the continued development and implementation of a unit assessment system.